

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

In re

CUSTOMS AND TAX ADMINISTRATION
OF THE KINGDOM OF DENMARK
(SKAT) TAX REFUND LITIGATION

This document relates to:
Case No. 18-cv-10094(LAK)

18-MD-2865 (LAK)

ECF Case

**ANSWER OF
VINCENT NATOLI**

Defendant Vincent Natoli (“Defendant” or “Natoli”), by and through his attorneys, CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED, as and for his Answer to the Complaint dated June 12, 2018 (the “Complaint”) states as follows:

AS TO THE PARTIES

1. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 1, except to admit that SKAT is a taxing authority of Denmark.
2. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 2.
3. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 3, except to admit that Defendant Roger Lehman (“Lehman”) communicated on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Pension Plan (“Natoli Management Plan”).
4. Defendant admits the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 4. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 4, except to admit that he resided

at 28 Lee Road, Livingston, New Jersey 08867, and to admit that Defendant Natoli Management listed the same address on its withholding tax refund claims.

AS TO THE NATURE OF THE ACTION

5. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 5, except to admit that SKAT is a taxing authority of Denmark.

6. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 6, except Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent tax refund scheme to deceive SKAT.

7. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 7, except Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent scheme.

8. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 8, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted refund claims for tax withheld on dividends earned on the shares of Danish companies, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

9. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 9, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted withholding tax refund claims and received tax refunds, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

10. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 10, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted withholding tax refund claims and received tax refunds, and Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

11. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 11, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan received refunds of tax, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

12. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 12, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

13. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 13, except Defendant does not have knowledge sufficient to admit or deny allegations with respect to all claimants.

a. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 13.a., except Defendant admits that Defendant Lehman communicated in writing with the Payment Agent regarding the tax refund claims on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan.

b. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 13.b., except Defendant denies

submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

c. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 13.c., except Defendant denies the allegations that Defendant Natoli Management Plan did not own shares in Danish companies and had not earned dividends on those shares.

14. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 14.

15. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 15, except to admit that SKAT made payments for Defendant Natoli Management Plan, and except that Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent scheme.

16. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 16, except Defendant denies participating in a fraudulent scheme.

17. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 17, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan was paid withholding tax refunds.

AS TO JURISDICTION & VENUE

18. Paragraph 18 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer is required to Paragraph 18, Defendant admits that the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, that SKAT is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state, and that Defendants are citizens of a state, and Defendant denies allegations in Paragraph 18 to the extent they suggest that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the matter.

19. Paragraph 19 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required.

AS TO THE FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 20, except to admit that SKAT is the relevant taxing authority.

21. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 21, except to admit that a certain percentage of dividends is withheld by Danish companies as withholding tax on dividends.

22. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 22, except to admit that under certain circumstances foreign shareholders may be entitled to a refund of the withholding tax.

23. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 23, except to admit that under certain circumstances, U.S. pension plan shareholders may be entitled to a refund of tax withheld on dividends paid by Danish companies.

24. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 24, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted withholding tax refund claims and that SKAT paid refunds of the withholding tax, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

25. Defendant denies having sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny allegations contained in Paragraph 25.

26. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 26, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted withholding tax refund claims, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

27. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 27, except to admit that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted refund claims to SKAT through Syntax GIS ("Syntax"), and Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

28. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 28, except to admit that Defendant Natoli Management Plan received tax refund payments.

29. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 29, except to admit or deny as follows:

a. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 29.a.;

b. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 29.b.;

c. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 29.c.;

d. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 29.d., except that Defendant admits that Defendant Lehman communicated on behalf of Defendant Natoli

Management Plan in connection with the tax refund claims submitted on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan; and

e. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 29.e., except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan obtained a statement from the Internal Revenue Service containing the information as set forth in the allegations contained in Paragraph 29.e.

30. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 30, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

31. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 31.

32. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 32, except to admit that SKAT paid withholding tax refunds for Defendant Natoli Management I Plan.

33. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 33, except to deny submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

34. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 34, except to admit that the tax refund claims were submitted on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan, and except that Defendant denies that the tax refund claims submitted on behalf of Defendant Natoli

Management Plan were submitted as described in Paragraph 29 of the Complaint, except as otherwise admitted in response to Paragraph 29.

35. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 35, except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on behalf of any claimant or otherwise participating in the fraudulent scheme. Defendant denies the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 35, except to admit that Defendant Lehman communicated on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan with Syntax in connection with the submission of the tax refund claims for Defendant Natoli Management Plan.

36. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 36, except Defendant denies submitting a fraudulent tax refund claim on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in the fraudulent scheme. Defendant denies the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 36, except to admit that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted its tax refund claims through Syntax.

37. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 37. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 37, except Defendant admits that one (1) withholding tax refund claim totaling at least \$196,000 (US), was made on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the third sentence of Paragraph 37, except

Defendant admits that the tax refund claim was submitted to SKAT on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan sometime in November 2014.

38. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 38.

39. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 39, except Defendant admits that SKAT made the tax refund claim payment sometime in November 2014 in connection with the tax refund claim submitted on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan, and Defendant denies submitting false tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

40. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 40, except Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted a tax refund claim, and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the second sentence of Paragraph 40, except to admit that Defendant Natoli Management Plan submitted a tax refund claim and received tax refund payment sometime in November 2014. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the third sentence of Paragraph 40, except to admit that Defendant Lehman signed a power of attorney on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan.

41. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in the first sentence of Paragraph 41, except that Defendant admits that Defendant Natoli Management Plan and several others listed an address of

28 Lee Road, Livingston, New Jersey, in their withholding tax refund claims and except Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the second sentence of Paragraph 41, except to admit that Defendant was listed on Natoli Management LLC's filings with the State of New Jersey.

42. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 42, except as admitted in response to Paragraph 43 through 45.

43. Paragraph 43 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer to Paragraph 43 may be deemed required and to the factual component of the allegations, Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 43, except that Defendant admits that Defendant Lehman executed a document for Defendant Natoli Management Plan sometime in October 2014.

44. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 44 except Defendant admits that Defendant Lehman signed a power of attorney on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan, and except Defendant denies submitting false tax refund claims on any claimant's behalf or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

45. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 45, except to admit that Defendant Lehman communicated on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan and another claimant regarding

their tax refund claims, which listed an address of 28 Lee Road Livingston, New Jersey 07039, in their withholding tax refund claims.

46. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 46, except Defendant admits that the Payment Agent submitted withholding tax refund claims on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan, and Defendant denies submitting fraudulent tax refund claims on behalf of any claimants or otherwise participating in a fraudulent scheme.

47. Paragraph 47 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer to Paragraph 47 may be deemed required and to the factual component of the allegations, Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 47, except to admit that Defendant Lehman communicated on behalf of Defendant Natoli Management Plan regarding its tax refund claims.

48. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 48, except as admitted in response to Paragraph 29, and Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 48 as it relates to other claimants.

49. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 49.

50. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 50, except to admit that SKAT paid the tax refund claim payments with respect to Defendant Natoli Management Plan. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 50 as it relates to other claimants.

51. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 51.

52. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 52.

53. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 53. Moreover, Paragraph 53 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required.

54. Defendant denies having knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraph 54, except to admit that Defendant is aware that SKAT erroneously concluded that the tax refund claim submitted by Defendant Natoli Management Plan was fraudulent.

AS TO THE CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

(Fraud – Against All Defendants)

55. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 54 above.

56. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 56.

57. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 57.

58. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 58.

59. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 59.

COUNT II

(Aiding and Abetting Fraud – Against All Defendants)

60. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 59 above.

61. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 61.
62. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 62.
63. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 63.
64. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 64.
65. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 65.
66. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 66.

COUNT III

(Unjust Enrichment – Against All Defendants)

67. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 66 above.
68. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 68.
69. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 69.
70. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 70.
71. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 71.

COUNT IV

(Money Had & Received – Against All Defendants)

72. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 71 above.
73. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 73.
74. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 74.

COUNT V

(Negligent Misrepresentation – Against All Defendants)

75. Defendant repeats and incorporates his responses in paragraphs 1 through 74 above.

76. Paragraph 76 alleges legal conclusions to which no answer is required. To the extent that an answer to Paragraph 76 may be deemed required, Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 76.

77. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 77.

78. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 78.

79. Defendant denies the allegations in Paragraph 79.

AS TO THE REQUEST FOR RELIEF

80. The allegations set forth in the “WHEREFORE” clause constitute Plaintiff’s request for relief to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is necessary, Defendant denies that Plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested, or to any relief.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

As A First Affirmative Defense

81. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted for the reason that it does not assert a legal theory cognizable as a matter of law and it fails to allege sufficient facts to support a cognizable legal claim.

As A Second Affirmative Defense

82. The claims are barred by the long-standing doctrine of the Revenue Rule, which prohibits one sovereign from using courts of another sovereign to enforce its revenue laws.

As A Third Affirmative Defense

83. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations.

As A Fourth Affirmative Defense

84. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by the equitable doctrines of unclean hands, waiver, laches, and estoppel.

As A Fifth Affirmative Defense

85. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part for failure to join indispensable or necessary parties.

As A Sixth Affirmative Defense

86. The recovery by the Plaintiff, if any, should be barred because the subject matter of this lawsuit is the subject of another pending legal proceeding.

As A Seventh Affirmative Defense

87. Plaintiff's action is barred because of its failure to exhaust administrative and other legal remedies available to it.

As An Eighth Affirmative Defense

88. If the Plaintiff suffered any loss, damage, or injury, such damages were caused in whole or in part by, and arose out of, Plaintiff's culpable conduct, including but not limited to contributory negligence and assumption of risk.

As A Ninth Affirmative Defense

89. If the Plaintiff suffered any loss, damages, or injury, such alleged injuries and damages were caused, in whole or in part, by the negligence, assumption of risk, fault, and/ or

other culpable parties and/or third parties to this action, other than Defendant, for whose acts or omissions or breaches of legal duty Defendant is not liable.

As A Tenth Affirmative Defense

90. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by collateral estoppel.

As An Eleventh Affirmative Defense

91. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part because Plaintiff has failed to mitigate its alleged damages.

As A Twelfth Affirmative Defense

92. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by res judicata.

As A Thirteenth Affirmative Defense

93. If the Plaintiff suffered any loss, damage, or injury, such damages are barred in whole or part to the extent such damages have been or will be paid or indemnified by a collateral source.

As A Fourteenth Affirmative Defense

94. The recovery by the Plaintiff, if any, should be reduced by application of New Jersey law, including N.J.S.A. § 2A:15-5.3.

As A Fifteenth Affirmative Defense

95. The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred in whole or in part by waiver and release.

As A Sixteenth Affirmative Defense

96. Defendant reserves the right to add to and/or amend these Affirmative Defenses because of information that may become known during the course of discovery.

WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests a judgement dismissing the Complaint with prejudice, together with his costs, disbursements and attorney's fees and such other further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York

July 29, 2019

CAPLIN & DRYSDALE, CHARTERED

s/ Mark D. Allison

By: Mark D. Allison

Mark D. Allison
Zhanna A. Ziering
600 Lexington Avenue, 21st Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 379-6000

*Attorneys for Defendant
Vincent Natoli*